

### **REMARKS**

Applicant acknowledges receipt of the final office action dated June 30, 2008, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 20 as anticipated by Yie (US 4478368); and indicated that claims 3-5, 8, 10, 12-14 and 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 1 to 20 remain pending.

#### **Claim rejections under 35 USC 102**

In response to Applicant's previously submitted arguments, the Examiner states that, "the prior art discloses avoiding pressure fluctuations to eliminate the need for a pressure accumulator and including fluid and particle modulation as above." It is not clear to Applicant how this statement can function as a rebuttal of Applicants assertion that the prior art "seeks to avoid pressure fluctuations." Regardless of the reason disclosed in Yie, the fact remains that Yie teaches away from pressure fluctuation in the nozzles. This is in direct contrast to the present claims, which recite modulating the erosive power of the abrasive jet.

Nonetheless, claims 1, 15, and 17 have each been amended to further recite that the erosive power of the jet is controlled in relation to the position of the impingement area on the selected trajectory. As this limitation was previously in allowable claim 3, which has been canceled, Applicant submits that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance.

#### **Concluding remarks**

Applicants believe that each ground for rejection raised by the Examiner in the Office Action has been addressed. Because the amendments place the claims in condition for allowance, Attorney respectfully requests that they be entered and the rejections withdrawn.

In the event the Examiner has any questions or issues regarding the present application, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jan-jette Blange.

By /Marcella D. Watkins/  
Attorney, Marcella D. Watkins  
Registration No. 36,962  
(713) 241-1041

P.O. Box 2463  
Houston, Texas 77252-2463